

Department of Energy, make it more efficient, get better use of taxpayer dollars. Then to wake up and read the newspaper and find that the Department of Energy chief, Ms. Hazel O'Leary, Cabinet member, has taken \$43,500 of public money to go out and investigate the media, rate newspapers, rate reporters, try to coerce those who give bad stories, in her opinion, to give better stories, that is at least two, maybe three jobs at the Savannah River site.

Along with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] who made this amendment, can you imagine what would happen to a Member of Congress if they did such a thing? They should lose their job, and so should Ms. O'Leary. This is really an offensive event. It was one of many events that show there is no leadership over in the Department of Energy. I think it is a good example of what happens when an agency continues to grow with no clear mission or well-defined purpose. All of a sudden, it is more important what people think of you than what you are actually doing.

I would just like to let everyone know that I find it highly inappropriate for the Department of Energy chief to take \$43,500 of hard-earned public money and try to recreate her image at a time when we are downsizing the Department and we are making hard decisions throughout the land. The problem with the Department of Energy is not an image problem, it is a substance problem. We need to have a well-defined, clearly-defined energy policy. We need to clean these sites up instead of talking about it. We need to get on and develop our national defense needs, like tritium production, which is within the venue of the Department of Energy.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman continue to yield on that?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, we spend a lot of time talking about travel, and now this silliness where the Secretary has actually spent money, she is so paranoid apparently, about the way the Department itself, as well as she, personally, is being perceived in the press that she is spending taxpayer dollars to have reporters investigated.

But what is really at stake here is the fact that the primary responsibility of the Department of Energy is the warehousing and safeguarding of our nuclear weapons stockpile. Think about it. We are talking about bombs that can wipe out this Earth many, many times over.

When we cannot even have a Secretary and a Department that can control its own travel, its own spending, and is so paranoid that it is checking up on reporters in that way, that bodes terribly, terribly poorly for this core mission, which is critically important. We are not talking about muckraking for political benefit, here. What we are talking about is an extraordinarily important responsibility that rests with

the Secretary of the Department of Energy.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a bill going forward that says that we are trying to reduce the redundancy in government and eliminate the Department of Energy as a Cabinet level agency. I think this shows that this individual will take any means necessary to prevent the needed cuts to take place in her bureaucracy, even to the point of going and investigating some of the other reporters and Members of Congress, as well as reporters. I think that, as 68 others have, I will join and call for the resignation of the Secretary of Energy.

Mr. GRAHAM. If I may, Mr. Speaker, the article to which we are referring has a unique comment in it. A DOE official responded concerning the spending of \$43,500 to go out and investigate media outlets and reporters who report on the Department of Energy, favorable or unfavorable ratings, and made the comment:

A reporter's unfavorable rating meant we weren't getting our message across, that we needed to work on this person a little.

To me, that is a statement beyond belief, that again, if I as a Member of Congress took taxpayer money entrusted to my care to go out and work on somebody to make me look better, I should lose my job.

A HISTORIC OPPORTUNITY TO BALANCE THE FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are in a historic time right now for the House of Representatives and for the Congress generally. We have the opportunity for the first time since 1969 to in fact balance the budget. People say, "What do you mean by balance the budget? Doesn't the country already do that?" No, it is an unfortunate tale, but not since 1969 have we balanced the budget. School boards balance their budgets, county governments do, State governments and family budgets as well as corporations make sure they do not spend more than they bring in, but the Federal Government for many years, when they have more money that they have spent than they brought in, it just becomes a tax increase. Now we are up to almost \$5 trillion in years of Congresses, House and Senate and prior Congresses, basically spending more than they bring in.

I think the message we have heard from all of our districts, all 435 across the country in all 50 States, is that while we want direct services that the Federal Government can provide that are not already provided by the State government or the private sector, let us make sure we eliminate the fraud,

abuse, and waste. That is what this Congress is trying to do.

By balancing the budget, we are going to be able to achieve lower interest payments for those who own a house and are paying a mortgage, we will be able to lower the interest payments for cars, for people who are buying a vehicle over time, we will be able to lower the cost of college education, and, by balancing the budget, we will in fact increase the opportunities for companies to expand, to grow, and to hire. By having more employment and more people contributing to the tax base, we will stabilize the tax base.

We are on the threshold of an historic Congress in that we have passed the balanced budget, we will have passed tax reform, giving young people the opportunity to have an education, to have an elder care tax credit, to have a rollback of the 1993 increase of the Social Security tax, to allow seniors under that same tax reform proposals to be able to in fact earn more than \$11,280 without a deduction in their Social Security. They will be able to earn up to \$30,000 a year.

That will reduce the capital gains tax to 19 percent for individuals, 25 percent for companies, thus increasing job opportunities, savings, and expansion of businesses, and as well, we will have an adoption tax credit of \$5,000 for families who are trying to adopt a child. All of these are pro-business, pro-people ideas to help seniors, to help working class individuals, to help our young people.

We want to make sure that the next generation of children is not born with such a heavy debt, and by having the heavy debt it makes it harder to get a job, it makes it harder to keep a job, it makes it harder to enjoy the quality of life that we want to have that is better than we had. We can make sure that we build upon the American dream by working together in a bipartisan fashion to balance our budget, to make sure that we have businesses that are thriving, and to make sure that services that have to be performed by the Federal Government do not have all the bureaucratic red tape and the unnecessary costs that have occasioned them in previous years.

□ 1845

So I am looking forward to a final reconciliation bill, a final legislation dealing with the House and Senate, working together and hopefully also having the President's assistance as well, to make sure that we do what the American people want, and that is balance the budget, reduce spending that is wasteful, reduce excessive cost, and provide the services that people need without bankrupting the Nation.

JOLTED BY WORLD EVENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AL-LARD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman

from Georgia [Ms. McKINNEY] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to provide an update on the redistricting battle that we are continuing to fight in the State of Georgia in an effort to save not just the 11th Congressional District, but also the 2d Congressional District, the two new majority-minority districts that are the equal opportunity districts in the State of Georgia.

Before I talk about what is happening recently with redistricting, I would like to just say a few words about how we have been jolted by world events. The assassination of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. We have had several of our colleagues come down here and tell their stories about what the Prime Minister meant to them. I had an opportunity to meet Prime Minister Rabin, and I would like to share the few moments that I had with him and what it means to me.

We were in an international relations meeting, and some of our colleagues can be so boarish sometimes. One of our colleagues was pointing his finger and becoming rather animated and turning red as he tried to make a very strong point to the Prime Minister. I had seen this particular Member behave the same way toward President Aristide, and I thought that perhaps this particular Member had a problem with race. But when I saw him doing the same thing with Rabin, I knew that it was probably just that ugly Americanism coming out, that ugly American that we are known to be around the world that we need to try and change.

When my colleague finished, I felt compelled to speak up and say to the Prime Minister, well, Mr. Prime Minister, I want you to know that that gentleman does not speak for me and he does not speak for people who think like me, who are very supportive of Israel, who are very supportive of the peace process, and who want America to be a part of your success. Prime Minister Rabin turned to me and he said, I am not the enemy of America's mothers.

So while we struggle with the senseless assassination of Prime Minister Rabin, we all must learn to let go of the hate and to work toward peace.

So even as we fight right now and become even jolted by things that are happening in our domestic policies as well, we still have to learn to let go of the hate. Sometimes it is very difficult. Right-wing, extremist talk does lead to extremist behavior, and right now while we are discussing our Nation's budget, it is perhaps the most important piece of legislation that this Congress will debate.

The budget is a statement of our Nation's priorities, and for the first time in 40 years, the Republicans, who now have a majority in the House and in the Senate, can state what their prior-

ities are to this Nation and to our world.

I remember when I ran for Congress back in 1992. There were a whole lot of people who did not believe. In fact, there were a lot of people who kind of laughed. They said, she wants to be a Congresswoman from Georgia? Who does she think she is, or what does she think she is? It was very difficult for me to find friends. It was very difficult for me to raise money. It was very difficult for me to put together the kind of organization that people readily associate with congressional races, but I got here. After I got here I found out that friends came real easy, and folks were falling all over themselves to become my friend.

So it seems that the new Republican majority is falling all over themselves, and they are falling all over themselves to do what they have not been able to do for the last 40 years, and that is to give special breaks to their rich, wealthy, elite friends, people who have always been able to wind themselves inside the political process and who have been able to find their way inside rooms, halls, for deals. So we should not be surprised that in this budget we see that the rich are super represented and everybody else, well, they have to fend for themselves.

In this bill, there are special breaks. I have four pages of special interest deals for special interest friends, from the oil companies to ski resorts, to large corporations, corporations, with large capital gains, corporations with large pension funds, the banking industry, mining companies, rich ranchers out west who think that our land is their land. Pharmaceutical drug companies, health insurance companies, infant formula companies, doctors, doctors, doctors, nursing home industry, coal companies, gambling interests, even football coaches have been able to find a little special treatment in this Republican budget.

We have seen that some folks are going to have to pay the price. Our seniors pay the price. Medicare funds to Georgia will be cut by \$6 billion. Mr. Speaker, 56,000 seniors in the 11th district alone will see their premiums increase. Georgia hospitals will lose \$2 billion over the next 7 years. Hospitals in the 11th district alone will lose \$138 million. Georgia will lose another \$5 billion in Medicaid cuts over the next 7 years. Students, with their student loans will be paying, on average, an additional \$600. 3,416 students in the 11th district alone.

The earned income tax credit. Who in the world could be against the earned income tax credit? Well, these folks here want to cut the earned income tax credit. Almost 600,000 working families in Georgia stand to lose the earned income tax credit, 52,000 working poor families in the 11th district alone.

Republicans have definitely defined themselves. On Medicare, GINGRICH said, now, we do not want to get rid of it in round one because we do not think

that that is politically smart, and we do not think that is the right way to go through a transition period. But we believe it is going to wither on the vine because we think people are voluntarily going to leave it. Wither on the vine, Medicare.

So the Republicans have done a good job of defining themselves, and now it is up to the Democrats to define themselves.

What is it that the Democrats stand for? Well, one thing we know for sure is that Democrats stand with seniors against these devastating Medicare cuts. Democrats stand with children and the poor against the decimation of Medicaid. Democrats stand with college kids when they are trying to fund their education. Democrats stand with the millions of working families who use the earned income tax credit. Democrats stand with little kids who deserve a healthy start and a head start in life. Democrats stand with the jobless, with the workers who find themselves jobless because their factory has moved in search of low-wage labor. Democrats stand with our lowest-wage workers who are in need of an increase in the minimum wage. Democrats stand with our urban and suburban areas in dire need of infrastructure, and Democrats stand with folks who just want a fair shake from their Government.

Marian Wright Edleman complains in The New York Times article of November 6 that the American people are asleep, sleeping through this revolution. The story reads, "Marian Wright Edleman was seething. 'I have been so frustrated trying to get the message out', she said. 'It is immoral what is going on in Washington today. The country is sleeping through this revolution. What we are witnessing', she said, 'is an unbelievable budget massacre of the weakest. It is absolutely wrong.'"

Marian Wright Edleman has dedicated her life to the pursuit of civil rights and equal rights and rights for our children.

But as I struggle with the Democratic party, on behalf of Democratic values, to make a Democratic stand, there are some Democrats who do not value me or my participation in this process. The last time I checked, there was no whites-only sign on the Democratic party. The last time I checked, there was no white-only sign for Democratic values.

The Democratic party is a party of diversity. It is a place where women have a place. It is a place where minorities have a place. It is a party where liberals, moderates, middle of the roaders, all have a place and ought to be respected.

Mr. Speaker, something is going on in the south, and that something that is going on in the south is saying, you black folks, you do not have a place in the Democratic party. You get out. Move out of the way, because we do not want you. That is what my State

Democratic party is doing in the State of Georgia.

□ 1900

The Florida plaintiffs were bold enough to say what other folks were thinking. In their brief, the case is Johnson versus Smith, which is an effort to get rid of the congressional district that is represented by Congresswoman BROWN, they write:

In the 103d Congress which met in 1993 and continues to meet through 1994, the legislation which was passed included a budget which enacted substantial increases in taxes and gun control legislation which had been put before the two prior Congresses but which had failed to gain passage. The Congressional Black Caucus, which consists of 37 Democrats and 1 Republican congressman, claims responsibility for those legislative successes. Particularly in the area of gun control, where 37 of the 38 African-American congressmen voted for banning certain gun sales, legislative passage could not have been secured without the votes of 12 African-American congressmen from the South whose congressmen traditionally voted against gun control measures.

Representatives Brown, Hastings, and Meek all voted in favor of the bill. The Congressional Black Caucus has also supported increased power for political action committees \$5 million in funding for prevention programs as part of the crime bill, and the granting to death row inmates of the right to challenge their convictions on the basis that those convictions, as shown by a statistical analysis, were racially motivated.

The process of gerrymandering congressional districts has, therefore, had a substantial impact on the political debates concerning issues of our time. However, it has resulted in the passage of legislation which would not otherwise have been passed without gerrymandered districts.

So I think we have it there in black and white, which is kind of literal, that the Florida plaintiffs are upset because the Congressional Black Caucus has a modicum of power for a change, because the Congressional Black Caucus has a seat at the policymaking table, because there are three African-Americans who happen to be able to represent the State of Florida in the U.S. Congress.

I think that is a shame, that folks would actually think and then articulate an idea that black people have no place here and then would act on that idea in an effort to get us out of here.

That is what this redistricting battle is all about. It is an effort to get black people out of elected office. There is no doubt about it in my mind.

Now as a result of the most recent events in the State of Georgia, I can say unequivocally that the Democratic leadership in the State of Georgia feels the same way. Georgia Democrats believe that they should get rid of these black representatives, trade us in, trade me in, so that a white male can come here and represent those people who are already represented.

The reason that I cast my vote in a different way is because I represent people who have not been represented. This is new. But this is representative democracy. I thought that is what we all were fighting for.

Just a reminder, I have got these district maps here. I want to make sure that the American people understand that the judgment about what a beautiful district is, what a pretty district is, what an effective district is, is purely subjective. There have never been perfectly square or perfectly round districts. Districts have always been drawn with special interests in mind. As our Speaker of the House has said in the State of Georgia, "You can't take the politics out of politics," and redistricting is about as raw a form of politics as you can get.

So we can have here a 95-percent white district in the State of Illinois that has a shape that is not perfect and that district can go unchallenged.

We can have a district in the State of Texas that is 91 percent white that can be challenged on a map of all congressional districts from the State of Texas, a district that can look like this. It ain't square, it ain't perfectly round, but it is an effective district. Nobody has denied the Representative of Texas' Sixth District the opportunity to cast his vote here.

Then the three-judge panel in Texas looked at that configuration and said, "Well, it's OK, but let's go over here and let's find Barbara Jordan's historic district, let's declare that district unconstitutional," so they did.

"Let's go over here and find the majority Latino district and declare that district unconstitutional," so they did.

"Let's go over here and find a district that is 45 percent black and declare that district unconstitutional," so they did.

Obviously, only people of color are under assault in these redistricting cases. If the district is 90-percent white, obviously there is no race involved in that district; but if the district is 50-percent black, you better look out.

Of course, here is Georgia's 11th Congressional District, a district that provides representation from the south of DeKalb County over to the city of Augusta and down to the city of Savannah and all of these rural areas in between. One and a half million African-Americans in rural Georgia have never had representation before. Now they finally have a little bit of representation, and some greedy folks want to come and take that away from them.

What does a quiet hug in the Georgia State reapportionment office tell me? A hug between the most powerful Democrat in the State of Georgia and the lawyer for the plaintiffs, hugging, in congratulation, in celebration, of their victory. Mighty amazing.

Then, what am I to make of a statement by the State's attorney? Now the State of Georgia is supposed to be defending, well, as much of this as they can, and the other district on the other side of the State. But, no, the State's attorney says, "Well, we only want one black district."

So now the story I thought I was telling months ago is now even more trag-

ic and true. It is even more tragic, because the State has now shown its hand. It has joined with the plaintiffs. The State failed to put up any witnesses in the trial. The State played dead. The State has joined with the plaintiffs, and the plaintiffs have an agenda.

What is their agenda? Their agenda is to reconstruct the district so that my previous Democratic opponent can win. What they want to do is get rid of me and replace me with the man who ran because he did not think there was anything wrong with the district in 1992, but when he lost, then there was something wrong with the district. Maybe he took some folks for granted. Maybe he did not have a record to run on. Maybe it was the right of the people of the 11th Congressional District to reject his candidacy, because maybe he just did not stand for the right things.

There was a map that was on the walls in the legislative office building, and nobody paid any attention to the map, because the man who ran against me was a Democrat at the time. Then he flipped over and became a Republican, and everybody knows that our speaker of the house in Georgia is a yellow-dog Democrat. There is no way in the world that our yellow-dog Democrats are going to ally themselves with this flip-flop Democrat turned Republican.

But there was a map. Now all we have to do is just think back and remember that there was a map. The very first map that was on the wall was a DeLoach map, and then the very last map on the wall was a DeLoach map, and the maps that were taken to the Republican caucus, to the Black Caucus, was a DeLoach map.

Of course, nobody really realized this at the time, but now we can put two and two together and we can add and we can see that really our yellow-dog Democrats had joined up with the flip-flop Democrat-Republican, and their purpose was not to reinvigorate the two-party system in the State of Georgia but to reinvigorate old-line politics from the State of Georgia, Old South politics, the kind of politics that have made Georgia famous in the halls of the department of justice because Georgia is known for denying black people their rights.

But, at any rate, the plaintiffs claim that they want to reinvigorate the two-party system. Well, there is a way that you can do that. You do that with message. You do that with standing for something. You do that with fighting for causes and goals and objectives. You do not do that by ignoring people, by denying people representation, by using people as spare parts.

So now I and the people that I represent from South DeKalb throughout our heartland, our rural heartland, in Augusta and in Savannah are supposed to be nothing more than spare parts for aspirations for other folks, but they

cannot have their own hopes and aspirations for their own government.

The plaintiffs also as a part of their agenda want to dismantle and completely obliterate these integrated districts. These are integrated districts, the most integrated districts in the South. They want to get rid of them.

Now probably more insidious than anything else, the true aim is that they want to bleach the Democratic party.

□ 1915

What they want to do is to get me out of the room so that they can be in the room, and then they can exercise public will at the public till as they see fit, with impunity and without any meddling from folks who have a different point of view. If they want to bleach the Democratic Party, then they also want to bleach our Government.

Because they want to get rid of me. They want to take me out and replace me and replace me. What they want to do is to restore white dominance in the South. I want to be very clear about this. They can assign fancy names to it, but the bottom line is white resistance. It is what the South is known for.

Why is it that in the State of Georgia we fly a flag that has the Saint Andrew's cross on it? What is the Saint Andrew's cross? Saint Andrew's cross is the battle flag of the Confederacy.

Now, why would the State of Georgia want to fly the battle flag of the Confederacy on the State flag? They want to do that because they voted affirmatively, they took affirmative action in 1956 to place the battle flag of the Confederacy on our State flag because they wanted to resist Federal intrusion into their school system.

They did not like the Brown versus Board of Education decision in 1954, so they went slap-damn-it straight up to the legislature in 1956, and they put that doggone new change on Georgia's flag, and in 1995 we still live with the decision that was made in 1956.

Now they are all doing it in the name of the 14th amendment. That in and of itself is a cruel hoax, but there was probably another cruel hoax, and that was all of that time and all of the taxpayers' money that was spent in that special session. All of the tears, all of the anguish, all of the serious negotiation, was just a joke. It was a joke.

Now we know, because the first map that was on that wall was the last map that was on that wall, was the map that the State of Georgia sent to the trial. That map, State Senator Donzella James feared that it was a hoax, and so she wrote a piece which I will not read. I will just submit it for the RECORD, entitled "The Redistricting Hoax." She feared it. We did not know it.

The special session was a joke. Black elected officials were duped. Black elected officials, including me, were laughed at behind closed doors. \$500,000 of taxpayers' money was wasted. Yel-

low-dog Democrats have proved that they have got a streak in them, but it ain't loyalty.

My dad had a dream, and he did not know how to adequately articulate it. He wrote it down kind of jumbled up, because he was writing from his heart. He was not trying to be so clear. He was just trying to remember his dream.

He said:

I had a dream last night. I saw very clearly a group of white men gathered around a table, and they were plotting the future of black people in the South for the next century. I was surprised that I recognized all of them. They were all involved in the attempt to overturn the Voting Rights Act.

And he goes on to name who these people are. They are his Democrat leadership, because my dad is a Democrat. My dad is elected as a Democrat from the 51st State House District. They are his speaker, his Lieutenant Governor.

This distinguished group had been stunned by the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus at hearings before the Georgia Reapportionment Committee. The Caucus had shown unusual preparedness in its opposition to the dismantling of the majority black districts. In stinging testimony, the assertions of the plaintiff's attorney were proven to be untrue. The Caucus brought down from the University of Georgia a constitutional civil rights law expert in the person of Dr. Pamela Carlin, attorney Rod McDuff from Mississippi, who has fought civil rights cases all over the Nation, Selwyn Carter of the Southern Regional Council.

This emergency meeting was called because what was thought to be a routine turning back of the clock had gone awry. The blacks would not march back to slavery with their hats in their hands like their forefathers had before them. After much discussion, it was decided that the State would use an unheard of order demanding that the State appear before the court and present maps and testimony with only one week's notice. The threat of having judges draw the districts would scare the heck—that is not the word he used—out of the Black Caucus. A brilliant threat that would throw panic into the Caucus, because the Caucus is not really a player in this chess game. Black citizens are only pawns to be sacrificed in a fight between the major parties. The Democrats have three Members serving in Congress, but they do not count because they are black. So the plan is to banish the black Congressmen and spread the black citizens who vote 95-percent Democrat among the other districts.

The lawsuit was filed against the State. Black people play no significant role in State government, thus no hand at the table. So as his plaintiffs fight the State to remove blacks from public office, the State is helping as they connive in that backroom hovering over that table.

Now this was my dad's dream. But what he did not know was that later on there was a hug in a backroom between the State and the plaintiffs. He was absolutely right. My dad's fears came true. And so in the course of this cruel, tragic redistricting hoax, the Georgia Legislature voted to dismantle 11 majority black districts, 9 in the State House and 2 in the State Senate. It was all planned from the very beginning.

"General Assembly Held Hostage," that was the flier sent out, "targeted black districts." "Told them if you all

don't do right, we are going to take away your districts." "Tyrone Brooks, you are nothing but a troublemaker anyway." He is the premier civil rights fighter in the State of Georgia. "We will just take your district away."

Eugene Tillman, newly drawn district, gentleman came before the Reapportionment Committee. He said, "I come from a county named Liberty, but they still treat us like slaves." His district is gone. His representation is gone in this cruel, cruel hoax.

So now, the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus members, certain members, have signed a letter to Deval Patrick asking that the plan that disbanded those 11 State legislative districts not be pre-cleared, because in the course of a special session that was convened for the purpose of fixing the problem in the 11th district, nothing happened in the 11th district. They did not do that. They did not get around to it.

But they did find the time to dismantle 11 majority black districts, 11 opportunity districts for folks who do not have representation to get a little representation. Bill Shipp, one of our noted columnists, wrote a story and says, "Are the bad old days back?" It is a question I asked, are the bad old days back?

Does the Democratic leadership of the State of Georgia think that they can just wipe me out of Congress, off the map, and think that I will go away quietly? No way. I will not go quietly because I represent people, people who are sick and tired of being taken for granted, and people who are not going to stand to see the representation that they now have snatched away from them.

It will not be the first time. On the grounds of the Georgia State capital there is a statue. That statue commemorates the service of 33 African-Americans who were elected but who were expelled in 1868 for no other reason than the color of their skin. The title of the statue is "Expelled Because Of Color."

I stand today on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, the most powerful democratic body in the world, as perhaps the first African-American in the 20th century to be expelled because of the color of my skin. That is not what America is supposed to be about, but that is what American has been about. It happened in 1868.

It happened in 1901. Representative George White from North Carolina, he was a U.S. Congressman and he was kicked out. So that makes me think that I can escape what has happened before, the fate of black people to be expelled from representative democracy because they do not deserve representation?

□ 1930

George White said, "This, Mr. Chairman, is perhaps the Negro's temporary farewell to the American Congress. But let me say Phoenix-like, he will rise up

some day and come again. These parting words are in behalf of an outraged, heart-broken, bruised and bleeding, but God-fearing people; faithful, industrious, loyal people, rising people, full of potential force." George White did not go quietly, and neither will I.

The attorney for the State of Georgia representing Democratic leadership in the State of Georgia said at the trial in Augusta, "Our position is that Section 2 does not mandate a second Congressional black district."

I think that just about says it all. The fears that we had in the middle of the special session, at the end of the special session; the confusion that we experienced at the beginning of the special session and all during the special session, was a joke. It was a hoax. Folks were laughing at us.

I had faith, hope, and trust in my Democratic leadership of the State of Georgia, because I am a Democrat too. And when I come up here and I vote, I do not see anything on my card that says "Black vote," or "Black Democrat." I do not see that. I vote yea or nay, just like everybody else.

Other folks see that. And then other folks bring what they see that is ugly to the political process. Now the whole Nation is wrapped up in this issue of race, when maybe really all it is is just a matter of greed. But greedy folks will use the issue of race. Greedy folks will divide people. Greedy folks will say "You all do not deserve to be together," so that they can continue to get and get and get, and take and take and take.

Claude McKay says the following in his poem, "If We Must die:"

If we must die, let it not be like hogs
Hunted and penned in an inglorious spot,
While round us bark the mad and hungry
dogs,
Making their mock at our accursed lot.
If we must die, O let us nobly die,
So that our precious blood may not be shed
In vain; then even the monsters we defy
Shall be constrained to honor us though
dead!
O kinsmen! we must meet the common foe!
Though far outnumbered let us show us
brave,
And for their thousand blows deal one
deathblow!
What though before us lies the open grave?
Like men we'll face the murderous, cowardly
pack,
PRESSED to the wall, dying, but fighting back!

That is about the way I am going to take this whole redistricting fight, pressed to the wall, dying, but fighting back.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO DISPOSE OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 115, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-331) on the resolution (H. Res. 261) providing for the consider-

ation of Senate amendments to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 115) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO DISPOSE OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2586, TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-332) on the resolution (H. Res. 262) providing for the consideration of Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 2586) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

IMPORTANCE OF BALANCING THE FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AL-LARD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues, particularly my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND] and other colleagues who will be coming to the floor shortly in what promises to be, I think, a very special and informative 1-hour special order.

We are going to talk about a variety of subjects tonight, Mr. Speaker; but, most of all, we are going to focus on the importance to America, to our constituents of passing a balanced Federal budget.

So much really hangs in the balance or is at stake. I guess I should not say "balance" too often, for fear that the people might be misled a little bit, but so much is at stake here over the next several days or several weeks, depending on how long it actually takes us to ultimately get a balanced budget signed into law. But our constituents and our colleagues listening tonight and perhaps viewing on C-SPAN should realize that House Republicans, as the new majority in Congress for the last 10 months, have been absolutely dedicated to balancing the Federal budget for the first time in a quarter of a century.

We have already passed on this House floor the 7-year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995, which balances the Federal budget in 7 years by limiting the growth, the increase in Federal spending, to 3 percent per year.

Now, the Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act also contains some very other important reforms, including genuine welfare reform that requires work for the able-bodied, emphasizes families, and provides people who are

dependent on welfare in the short-term real hope and opportunity for the future.

The Reconciliation Act also includes a significant tax cut for families and for economic growth and job creation in the private sector. This is the dividend, if you will, the economic dividend, for families resulting from getting our fiscal house in order at the Federal level. It is only right, since we all know that the beleaguered middle-class American family has been overburdened by the combination of high taxation and stagnant incomes for many, many years, it is only right that we keep our promises and provide them with much needed tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to my California colleague, Mrs. SEASTRAND, I want to point out earlier today the House passed a temporary increase in the Federal Government's borrowing authority. That is known as the debt ceiling. Basically, we sent a bill to the other body, the Senate, that allows the Federal Government to continue borrowing money for the purposes of financing a deficit until on or about December 12.

The passage of that legislation today follows on the heels of the past and of a continuing resolution which allows the Federal Government to keep the doors open and to keep paying its bills, meeting its financial obligations. That is the continuing resolution which passed on this floor yesterday.

When it came time to vote on the temporary increase in the debt ceiling, the short-term extension until December 12, we heard some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, some of the so-called moderate Democrats, make statements about wanting to balance the Federal budget in a bipartisan fashion. In fact, they even went so far, as is the prerogative of the minority party in the House of Representatives, to offer a so-called motion to recommit. They claim that that motion to recommit would allow us to achieve a balanced budget working in a bipartisan fashion.

But here is the flaw in their thinking. We would be remiss on this side of the aisle if we did not point out that a couple of weeks ago, we did pass the 7-year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act, which again was the key vote on whether a Member of Congress on either side of the aisle supports the idea of balancing the Federal budget in 7 years or less, whether that Member is willing to go on record as making the difficult decisions and the tough choices necessary to balance the Federal budget in 7 years.

Now, when we had that legislation on the House floor a couple of weeks ago, only 4 Democrats, only 4, there are 199 Democrats currently serving in the House of Representatives and only 4 had the courage to cross this middle aisle, which you might refer to as the partisan aisle, to support the House